

1 MINUTES OF THE  
2 November 18, 2008 Meeting of the  
3 Easton Planning & Zoning Commission  
4

5 Members Present: John Atwood, Chairman, and members, Tom Moore, Steve Periconi,  
6 Linda Cheezum and Dan Swann.  
7

8 Staff Present: Tom Hamilton, Town Planner, Zach Smith, Current Planner, Lynn  
9 Thomas, Long Range Planner and Stacie Rice, Planning Secretary.  
10

11 Mr. Atwood called the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission to order at  
12 1:00 p.m. The first order of business was the approval of the minutes of the  
13 Commission's October 16, 2008 meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Swann seconded by Mr.  
14 Periconi the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the October minutes.  
15

16 The first item discussed was **8475 Ocean Gateway**. The applicant, Bill Stagg, is  
17 requesting architectural review of **Sonic Drive-in Restaurant**. Mr. Stagg explained that  
18 at the October Planning Commission meeting the Commission voted 4-1 to approve the  
19 sketch site plan, but did not approve the proposed architecture. The architecture has been  
20 revised reducing the depth of the front canopy, bricked the entire front of the store,  
21 incorporated the canopy structure on the south side of the building into the principal  
22 building mass, incorporated brick pillars, added additional awnings and faux framing on  
23 the north side façade around poster displays, reduced the number of wall signs to 1,  
24 removed the tower roof feature over the drive-thru window, lowered the roof line over  
25 the drive-thru window. Mr. Smith explained that the applicant had received the  
26 necessary variances and special exception. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr.  
27 Moore, the Commission voted 4-1 (Mrs. Cheezum opposed) to approve the revised  
28 architecture as presented.  
29

30 The next item was **Waterside Village** requesting architectural review of **Building**  
31 **"H"** Waterside Village. At the October Planning Commission meeting the developers  
32 for Waterside Village shopping center were before the Commission seeking architectural  
33 approval for Building "H". At the meeting the Commission was concerned with single  
34 story building vs. 2 story building, proposed wall signage, and orientation of the building.  
35 Mr. Peter Clelland, developer explained they are proposing a one story building similar to  
36 the building that was previously approved by the Commission. Mr. Smith explained that  
37 after reviewing the files the staff believes the Planning Commission did approve  
38 architectural elevations for Building "H" at the their February 2006 meeting. Mr.  
39 Clelland briefly discussed the signage of the proposed building. One will face Marlboro  
40 and one will face the parking lot. The building frontage in each instance is 104 linear  
41 feet. The staff recommends limiting the area of each sign to 1 square foot of sign area  
42 per linear foot of building frontage. This would allow 2 wall signs each a maximum of  
43 104 square feet. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Moore the Commission  
44 voted 5-0 to approve the revised architecture and signage as presented.  
45

46 The next item on the agenda was review of proposed **Sign Plan** for **Waterside**  
47 **Village** shopping center. Mr. Peter Clelland of BET Investments explained that Citi  
48 Smith Barney currently occupies over 7,000 square feet of upper story office space in  
49 Building "F" located within Waterside Village. Mr. Smith explained that the Zoning  
50 Ordinance does not specifically provide standards for signage related to upper story  
51 space. The Ordinance would allow one wall sign for this use as it has its own entrance.  
52  
53  
54

4  
5 The sign would be limited to 10 square feet in area and would be placed on the south  
6 façade of the building. Mr. Clelland is requesting 2 wall signs each 31.17 square feet in  
7 area. They propose to located one sign on the south façade and on the east façade of  
8 Building "F". A general sign plan was never submitted for this shopping center and  
9 signage has generally been reviewed and approved based on the Town's sign regulations.  
10 Upon motion of Mrs. Cheezum, seconded by Mr. Periconi, the Commission voted 5-0 to  
11 approve the 2 wall signs as proposed and the applicant will come back to the Commission  
12 at a later date with a master sign plan addressing all signage needs for the entire shopping  
13 center.

14  
15 The next item was a **Temporary Use request for a Homeless Shelter**. Ms.  
16 Evelyn Sedlack on behalf of Voice of the Homeless explained they would like to operate  
17 a temporary cold weather shelter that would rotate weekly or bi-weekly from one faith  
18 community to another during January and February 2009. It would be open daily from  
19 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. An evening meal, breakfast and bagged lunch would be provided  
20 for each of the five guests. Mr. Hamilton stated that the Ordinance does not clearly  
21 address homeless shelters but felt the use was a customary function of a church and thus  
22 permitted as accessory use to a church. Mr. Hamilton spoke to the Easton Police  
23 Department who supported the shelter as described. Upon motion of Mr. Swann,  
24 seconded by Mrs. Cheezum the Commission voted 5-0 to agree with Mr. Hamilton's  
25 interpretation and allow the use as an accessory function of a Church. The only issue that  
26 remains to be resolved is a Fire Code issue.

27  
28 The next item was from staff concerning the final plats for **Easton Village, Phase**  
29 **4**. Mr. Hamilton asked that the Commission authorize their Chairman to sign the plats  
30 when appropriate. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mrs. Cheezum the  
31 Commission voted 5-0 to authorize Mr. Atwood to sign the plats for Easton Village,  
32 Phase 4.

33  
34 The next item was discussion of the **2009 Zoning Ordinance Amendments**.  
35 Mr. Thomas discussed proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance with the  
36 Commission. He stated that these represented this year's annual packet of amendments  
37 and are the accumulation of possible revisions that we have noted since we last amended  
38 the Ordinance about a year ago. He pointed out that the staff is not necessarily  
39 advocating that any of these be approved. They are simply issues that have arisen over  
40 the previous year and at least warrant discussion. He then briefly described each  
41 proposed amendment. In total there are 11 proposed amendments. The Commission  
42 decided that one of them (concerning offsite real estate identification signs) should not be  
43 pursued. They were at least willing to review Ordinance language of the other proposed  
44 changes. Mr. Thomas will draft such language and present it to the Commission at the  
45 December meeting.

46  
47 The Commission then discussed the pending major issues concerning the  
48 **Comprehensive Plan**. Mr. Thomas had prepared a memo summarizing what he  
49 considered the major outstanding issues to be. The Commission first reiterated their  
50 previous stance that the Growth Area should not change. They then considered possible  
51 changes to the Priority Growth Areas Map. There were six specific requests from land-  
52 owners to change the Growth Areas Maps. After presentations by representatives of  
53  
54

6 property-owners and discussion amongst the Commission, motion was made, seconded  
7 and approved to make no changes to either of this map at this time. Next, the  
8 Commission discussed the general Growth Area concept and changing from a three-tier  
9 priority system to a two-tier system. Mr. Thomas explained that this would simply be  
10 "Appropriate for Annexation" or "Not Appropriate for Annexation during the Current  
11 Comprehensive Plan Cycle". The Commission thought that this was a better system than  
12 the three-tiered system we have today and advised staff to pursue such a change.  
13

14 The commission then moved on to a discussion of the Future Land Use Map. Mr.  
15 Thomas indicated that there would be some staff-initiated changes that the Commission,  
16 with their approval, would see in the Draft Plan. These would reflect the creation of a  
17 new "Institutional" Use and the classification of properties that logically fall within that  
18 classification. Another staff change would be to correct any inaccuracies on the Land  
19 Use Map relative to Commercial vs. Industrial Land in the general Black Dog  
20 Alley/Kennedy Street East/Nixon Street area. The Commission indicated that these  
21 changes should be prepared. One change requested from the public, that being a request  
22 by Mandrin Easton to reclassify approximately 11 acres from residential to commercial  
23 was also supported by the Commission.  
24

25 The Commission then discussed the East-West Connector Road. After a discussion  
26 amongst themselves and with the staff, the Commission decided that the road should  
27 remain in the Plan, but it should be clearly stated that this road is not to be built by the  
28 Town. Rather it will remain in the Plan so that in the event that any development  
29 proposal occurs during the life of the Plan, developers can be made aware of this road  
30 and incorporate it into their development, contribute to its construction (if appropriate),  
31 etc. The Commission also indicated that the Plan should clearly and strongly emphasize  
32 the importance of improvements to the Route 50/Matthewstown Road and Route  
33 50/Dover Road intersections.  
34

35 The discussion of Comprehensive Plan issues concluded with a brief description of what  
36 remains to be decided. Mr. Thomas stated that the one remaining big-picture issue is the  
37 East-side Collector Road. Mr. Hamilton reminded the Commission that the Draft  
38 Transportation Plan they have briefly previously seen (at the meeting held at Eaton High  
39 School) reflected the elimination of the East-Side Collector and its replacement with a  
40 full grid system in this area. He stated that he is still working on refining this Plan and  
41 will present it for discussion at the December meeting.  
42

43 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. by  
44 motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Atwood.  
45

46 Respectfully submitted,  
47

48  
49 Stacie S. Rice  
50 Planning Secretary  
51  
52